



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,222	09/19/2001	Richard Brown	1509-220	8293

22879 7590 07/13/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

87

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/955,222

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the Amendment filed on 4/15/2005. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the claim, "authoriser" should be changed to "authorizer" and "authorising" be changed to "authorizing".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spies et al., US pat. No.5,689,565 in view of Scheidt et al., US pat. No.6,754,820.

As to claim 1, Spies discloses a credential transfer method for use on a distributed electronic network, the method comprising the steps of a sender (participant 22a fig.1) communicating to a recipient (Participant 22b fig.1) a credential index comprising an index referring to at least one credential (sending and exchanging users' credential information), the index including user-provided information about the credential by selecting at least one of the credentials from the index of at least one credential provided by the sender (see fig.1, abstract, col.5 line 21 to col.6 line 24), the recipient (22a fig.1) communicating to the sender (22b fig.1) an indication of the selected at least one credential and the sender providing to the recipient at least one credential corresponding to the selected at least one credential (providing secure and credential information between participants, see also fig.2, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 28).

Spies does not specifically disclose an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential such that the credential is not disclosed by the index. However, Scheidt discloses an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential (credential that restrict access) such that the credential is not disclosed by the index (using selecting "Secret" from the security level category as a credential during encryption would limit readership of the encrypted object to those who have read access to the "Secret" credential, see fig.3, col.5 line 31 to col.6 line 58 and col.10 lines 10-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2151

in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scheidt's secrete credentials into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to credentials id dependant on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category.

As to claim 2, Spies discloses the recipient responding to the credential index by determining whether the at least one credential is sufficient and the recipient communicating the result of the determination to the sender (see fig.2, col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 28).

As to claim 3, Spies discloses the recipient responding to the credential index by determining a service level according to the at least one credential indexed in the credential index and the recipient communicating the service level to the sender (using a certified trusted authority 26 fig.1 to process participant data information, see col.1 line 17 to col.8 line 28 and col.25 line 7 to col.26 line 41).

As to claim 4, Spies discloses that the sender communicates a plurality of credential indices to the recipient (see col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 28 and col.26 lines 14-65).

As to claim 5, Spies discloses the recipient responding to the credential index by determining a service level according to each of the plurality of credential indices

Art Unit: 2151

communicated to the recipient by the sender and communicating the service level (trusted level) corresponding to at least one of the credential indices to the sender (col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 45 and col.8 lines 10-56).

As to claim 6, Spies discloses that the recipient communicates a service level to the sender for each credential index communicated to the recipient by the sender (see fig.6, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 45 and col.12 lines 1-59).

As to claims 7-9, Spies discloses that the credential comprising a digital credential, indices to a plurality of credentials and the sender selecting a credential index from a plurality of available credential indices (see fig.4, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 45 and col.12 lines 1-59).

As to claim 10, Spies discloses a method of providing a service over a distributed electronic network, comprising:

a user (22a fig.1) communicating to a service authorizer (credential binding server 26 fig.1) a credential index comprising an index referring to at least one user-provided credential about the credential and the service authorizer (26 fig.1) responding to the index communicated by the user by selecting at least one of the credentials from the index of at least one credential provided by the user (22a fig.1) (sending and exchanging credential information, see fig.1, abstract, col.5 line 21 to col.6 line 24).

the service authorizer responding to the index communicated by the user by communicating to the user an indication of the selected at least one credential and the user responding to the indication of selected at least one credential by providing to the service authorizer at least one credential corresponding to the selected at least one credential and the service authorizer responding to the at least one credential corresponding to the selected at least one credential provided to the user by authorizing provision of the service to the user (providing secure and credential information between participants, see also fig.2, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 28 and col.11 line 22 to col.12 line 63).

Spies does not specifically disclose an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential such that the credential is not disclosed by the index. However, Scheidt discloses an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential (credential that restrict access) such that the credential is not disclosed by the index (using selecting "Secret" from the security level category as a credential during encryption would limit readership of the encrypted object to those who have read access to the "Secret" credential, see fig.3, col.5 line 31 to col.6 line 58 and col.10 lines 10-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scheidt's secrete credentials into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to credentials id dependant on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category.

As to claim 11, Spies discloses a computer readable memory configured so that it can be used to direct a computer to:

communicate a recipient (22a fig.1) a credential index comprising an index referring to at least one user provided credential and receive from the recipient an indication of at least one credential selected by the recipient from the index (sending and exchanging credential information between users, see fig.1, abstract, col.5 line 21 to col.6 line 24).

provide to the recipient (22a fig.1) at least one credential corresponding to the selected at least one credential (providing secure and credential information between participants, see also fig.2, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 28).

Spies does not specifically disclose an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential such that the credential is not disclosed by the index. However, Scheidt discloses an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential (credential that restrict access) such that the credential is not disclosed by the index (using selecting "Secret" from the security level category as a credential during encryption would limit readership of the encrypted object to those who have read access to the "Secret" credential, see fig.3, col.5 line 31 to col.6 line 58 and col.10 lines 10-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scheidt's secrete credentials into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it



would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to credentials is dependant on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category.

As to claim 12, Spies discloses a computer readable memory configured so that can be used to direct a computer to:

receive from a sender (22b fig.1) a credential index comprising an index referring to at least one credential and select from the index received from the sender at least one credential (sending and exchanging credential information between users, see fig.1, abstract, col.5 line 21 to col.6 line 24).

enable an action on receipt said at least one credential from the sender (providing secure and credential information between participants, see also fig.2, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 28).

Spies does not specifically disclose an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential such that the credential is not disclosed by the index. However, Scheidt discloses an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential (credential that restrict access) such that the credential is not disclosed by the index (using selecting "Secret" from the security level category as a credential during encryption would limit readership of the encrypted object to those who have read access to the "Secret" credential, see fig.3, col.5 line 31 to col.6 line 58 and col.10 lines 10-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scheidt's secret credentials

into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to credentials is dependent on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category.

As to claim 13, Spies discloses a processor for generating a digital credential index, the index comprising a data structure for providing an index to at least one user provided credential (sending and exchanging credential information, see fig.1, abstract, col.5 line 21 to col.6 line 24), whereby at least one credential can be selected on the basis of information provided within the data structure (providing secure and credential information between participants, see also fig.2, col.6 line 36 to col.7 line 28).

Spies does not specifically disclose an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential such that the credential is not disclosed by the index. However, Scheidt discloses an index further comprising credential information differing substantially from the credential (credential that restrict access) such that the credential is not disclosed by the index (using selecting "Secret" from the security level category as a credential during encryption would limit readership of the encrypted object to those who have read access to the "Secret" credential, see fig.3, col.5 line 31 to col.6 line 58 and col.10 lines 10-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scheidt's secret credentials into the computer system of Spies to restrict accesses to data information because it would have provided sensitivity level or multiple-level access control such that access to

Art Unit: 2151

credentials id dependant on the method of member identification and enforced domain authority dictated policies for multiple-level access control by credential category.

As to claim 14, Spies discloses that the data structure provides indices to a plurality of credentials (see col.25 lines 7-53).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 11 and 12 respectively.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

*A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U. S. C . Sect. 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).*

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2151  
7/10/2005